STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

# COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM "XCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Command:	Division:	Chapter;					
Stockton	Valley	6	101				
Inspected by:		Date:	11				
L. Chambers, Lt.		12/15/2009					

ge 1 of 2

0				
INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, con	Inspection docume	on number. Under "Forwent shall be utilized to do	ard to:" enter the no cument innovative	fill in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter text level of command where the document practices, suggestions for statewide be used if additional space is required.
☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level		Total hours expende inspection:	d on the	☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included
Follow-up Required:  ☐ Yes ☑ No	Duo Date: 1/15/2010			
Chapter Inspection:		a Transaction of the State		
Inspector's Comments Regar	rding Ir	nnovative Practices	); };	
None.		4		
Command Suggestions for S	tatewic	de Improvement:		
one.				
Inspector's Findings:				
Commander's Response:	Conci	ır or □ Do Not Cor	ncur (Do Not Co	ncur shall document basis for response)
<u> </u>				
Inspector's Comments: Shall etc.)	address	s non concurrence by o	commander (e.g.	, findings revised, findings unchanged,

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

# **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM** FXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

age 2 of 2

Command:	Division:	Chapter:
Stockton	Valley	6
Inspected by:		Date:
L. Chambers,	12/15/2009	

Required Action			
·		,	
Corrective Action Plan/	Timeline		

Employee would like to discuss this report with COMMANDER'S STONATURE	DATE ,
the reviewer.	1/12/.
(See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.)	1/13/10
/ INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE	DATÉ
( ) Oza CUS 12T.	12-15-99
Reviewer discussed this report with REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE	DATE/
employee / / H/ C/	1/27/2010
Concur Do not concur	15.1

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## DMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

Command: Stockton	Division: Vallev Div	Number:
Evaluated by:		Date:
L. Chambers, Lt.		12/15/2009
Assisted by:		Date:
K. Abercrombie, Sgt.		12/15/2009

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answ applicable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections sh discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exce Furthermore, the Exceptions Document shall include any follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only	all be comme ptions Docum and/or correc	nted on via nent and add ctive action(	the "Remar dressed to t s) taken. If	rks" section. Additionally, such the next level of command. this form is used as a Follow-up
TYPE OF INSPECTION	Lead Insp	ector's Signa	ture:	
☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level			,	
☐ Executive Office Level ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection	,   07-	¬ Cv	10/	T.
Follow-up Required:  The second of the control of t		er's Signatur	2	Date: 1/13/10
For applicable policy, refer to: GO 40.6			<i>f</i>	
'e: If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section	n shall be u	tilized for e	xplanation	1.
1. If the commander became aware that another agency or organization is proposing or has submitted a grant application to a funding agency other than the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) that appears to focus on traffic safety goals clearly within the jurisdiction of the Department, did the commander notify the appropriate assistant commissioner?	9	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
<ol> <li>Has OTS grant funding, through the Highway Safety Plan, been sought for traffic safety-related activities for the purpose of conducting inventories, need and engineering studies, system development or program implementations?</li> </ol>	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
3. Has the command sought grant funding to assist with the expenses associated with the priority programs identified by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration?	∑ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
4. Has the commander ensured grant funds are not being reallocated to fund other programs or used for non-reimbursable overtime expenditures?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
<ol><li>Are concept papers regarding grant funding submitted through channels to Grants Management Unit (GMU)?</li></ol>	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Was GMU contacted to determine the current personnel billing rates used for grant projects when preparing concept paper budgets?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
PEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## MMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

7.	Is supporting documentation of consent and acceptance (of the work, goods, or services provided by the state on behalf of a local government agency as required by 23 Code of Federal Regulations Part 1250) being submitted to OTS for all grant projects coded as "for local benefit"?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
8.	Were all copies of the grant project agreements, revisions, and claim invoices signed by the Project Director, or designated alternate?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9.	Were all inquiries or correspondence concerning the availability of grant funds or other contacts with grant funding agencies coordinated/processed through GMU?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are all expenditures of grant funds approved by GMU prior to entering into any obligations, with the exception of personnel costs?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are quarterly progress reports forwarded though channels to GMU in accordance with the instructions contained in the associated project MOU?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
12.	Are all requirements of the grant agreement and MOU being met?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13.	Is a final project report being prepared in accordance with the funding agency and departmental requirements upon the termination of the grant project?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14.	Does every invoice associated with a grant funded project contain the project number and name?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15.	Are all purchases of grant-funded equipment acquired under an OTS grant exceeding a unit cost of \$5,000 being documented on an Equipment Report, Form OTS-25?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16.	Has grant funded equipment been inspected to ensure it is being utilized in accordance with the respective grant agreement?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17.	Are applications for federal funds in accordance with Government Code Section 13326 including obtaining approval from the Department of Finance and/or the Governor's office prior to submission to the appropriate federal authority?  This would include any of the following:  • Applications for federal funds which are not included in the budget approved by the Governor.  • Applications for federal funds which exceed the amount specified in the budget.	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## )MMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Grant Management

18	Is a federal Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, filed with the State Clearinghouse for all approved unbudgeted grant	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	requests received by the Department of Finance?	<u> </u>			
	. Has any request for unanticipated federal funds met the criteria for legislative notification set forth in Control Section 28.00 of the annual Budget Act?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
20.	. Are grant funds being used for their intended purpose?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are grant applications related to the Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program (MCSAP) being routed through the Commercial Vehicle Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
22.	. Are grant applications related to the Homeland Security Grant Program being routed through the Emergency Operations Section before they are submitted to the funding agency?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
Questi	ons 23 through 26 pertain to the Grants Managemen	it Unit			
23.	Has GMU prepared an annual Management Memorandum to be disseminated to all commanders soliciting participation in the Department's Highway Safety Program?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
24.	Did GMU send the concept paper as an attachment to a memorandum through the Planning and Analysis Division to Assistant Commissioner, Field, and Assistant Commissioner, Staff, and their Executive Assistants?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks;
	Did GMU route copies of the Draft Grant Agreement using the CHP Form 60, Staff Summary Statement, to all commands with responsibility for or that have an interest in the project?	☐ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
26.	Was a Memorandum of Understanding between involved commands outlining the responsibilities of each command prepared and distributed by GMU?	☐ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
" ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ` ARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## MMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

Command: Stockton	Division: Valley Div	Number:
Evaluated by: L. Chambers, L		Date: 12/15/2009
Assisted by: K. Abercrombie	, Sgt.	Date: 12/15/2009

discrep Further	UCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answerable legal statues, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be documented on an Exceptions and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions. Document shall include any follow-up attion, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only	II be comme tions Docur and/or corre	ented on via nent and ad ctive action/	the "Rema dressed to (s) taken	rks" section. the next leve this form is a	Additionally, such
TYPE C	OF INSPECTION	Lead Insp	ector's Signa	iture:		
☐ Div	rision Level 🔀 Command Level	,	,	ſ		
ΠEV	<u> </u>	7-	$\sim CU^{\dagger}$	1	CT.	
	ecutive Office Level	Dimmano	Jer's Signatur	e:	- / .	Date:
	☐ Follow-up Inspection	W W		h y		1/13/10
HPM A	oplicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Chapter 6, 40.71, Chapters 2, 8, and 10, HPM 10.5, er 2, and HPM 10.3, Chapters 24 and 28.			0		
Note:	f a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section	shall be u	tilized for e	explanation	1.	
1.	Is the hiring company/agency for reimbursable overtime being held responsible for paying a minimum of four hours of overtime per CHP uniformed employee, regardless of length of service/detail?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
2.	Is a minimum of four hours overtime being allocated to each CHP uniformed employee(s) if cancellation notification is made 24 hours or less prior to the scheduled detail and the assigned CHP uniformed employee(s) cannot be notified of such cancellation?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
3.	Are reimbursable special project codes being used for all overtime associated with reimbursable special projects?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
4.	Is the commander ensuring nonuniformed personnel overtime hours are not reflected on the Report of Overtime Hours for Reimbursable Special Projects?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
5.	Is the commander ensuring non-reimbursable overtime is not being claimed for an employee, other than Bargaining Unit 7, while on vacation or compensated time off for hours worked during their regular work shift time?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
	Is "RDO" being written in the "Notes" section of the CHP 415, Daly Field Record, for overtime worked on a regular day off?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:	
7.	Is there a CHP 90, Report of Court Appearance - Civil Action, completed for each officer or sergeant when overtime is associated for civil court?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:	

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

## JMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Chapter 6 Command Overtime

8	employee's lunch period or indicate "None" if the employee worked through their lunch break?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
9	overtime?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	Are claimed overtime meals related to overtime worked within 50 miles of the employee's headquarters?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	1. If overtime is incurred by a peer support counselor, is the name of the employee to whom support was provided excluded from the CHP 415 of the counselor?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
	2. Is the "Notes" section on side two of the CHP 415 used to explain any overtime listed on side one of the CHP 415?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
13	Are employee's Compensated Time Off hours maintained within reasonable balances?	⊠ Yes	☐ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
14	I. Is the commander ensuring employees are not incurring overtime due to working over the allotted number of hours for any given Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) period?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
15	<ul> <li>Is the commander ensuring uniformed employees are not working voluntary overtime which results in them working more than 16.5 hours in a 24 hour period?</li> </ul>	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks:
16	Do the CHP 415 total overtime hours agree with the Monthly Attendance Report (MAR)?	⊠ Yes	□No	□ N/A	Remarks:
17	. Are the MARs retained for at least three years and contain the commander's signature?	⊠ Yes	□ No	□ N/A	Remarks: